UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/040,696	12/28/2001	Laurent Chouraqui	1386-01	4983

35811   7590   02/04/2008

IP GROUP OF DLA PIPER US LLP
ONE LIBERTY PLACE
1650 MARKET ST, SUITE 4900
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER
SHEPARD, JUSTIN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned.patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 December 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-8 and 11-18* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-8 and 11-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/21/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Page 1, paragraph beginning with "Chernock is directed" continuing onto page 2:

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the content being inserted into the screens is transmitted with the broadcast program) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Specifically, the applicant argues that Chernock discloses that pre-stored information is inserted into the screen and not content downloaded to the STB. In column 3, line 64 to column 4, line 3 Chernock discloses that "news and sports" information is inserted into programs being displayed on the television. It is the examiners interpretation that if news information is displayed to the viewer, this information must be downloaded to the STB from an external source, as "news information" would not be able to be pre-installed on a STB before it left the factory and be relevant or useful to a viewer.

Page 2, paragraph beginning with "Unlike Claim 1":

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the details of the "application" being transmitted, and how the "application" differs from the objects disclosed by Chernock) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Page 2, paragraph beginning with "Use of the data":

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the details of the structure, which is detailed in paragraph 6 of the specification) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Page 2, last paragraph continuing onto page 3:

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the details of the structure of the INITIALIZATIONS and DRAWS) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988

F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Specifically, the examiner is reading the

initial location of the animation to be inserted (found in the disclosure of Chernock) as

meeting the limitation of an INITIALIZATION found in the claim.

Page 4, paragraph beginning with "In sharp contrast":

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain

features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

(i.e., the details of "treatment" as defined in the specification) are not recited in the

rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification,

limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988

F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The applicant argues that LaRocca,

which teaches that information should be used by a particular type of receiver (as

admitted by the applicant), does not meet the limitations of "treatment by a digital

treatment" found in the claim. The examiner is interpreting the teachings of LaRocca

(i.e. the determining of which information should be used by a certain type of receiver)

as meeting the limitations found in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1.   Claims 1, 4, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Chernock in view of LaRocca.

.   Referring to claim 1, Chernock discloses a process for transmission of a digital

televised broadcast comprising an interactive application which can be activated by

superposition on an animated image background on a digital terminal at least in part by

a television viewer, said interactive application being made of elemental components

comprising different image screens between which the viewer can navigate, the process

comprising:

transmitting elemental components in a data structure that groups said elemental

components in the different classes(column 3, line 64 – column 4, line 3), said

components being materialized in the form of codes calling up native functions (column

3, lines 46-48; column 4, lines 10-11), comprising components of "INITIALIZATIONS"

defining positioning in a data structure of other components (column 4, lines 17-18),

components of "DRAWS" corresponding to graphic representations materialized in the

structure in the form of codes calling up native functions of a host language of a digital

terminal (column 4, line 22), components of "PALETTES" corresponding to color

palettes (column 5, lines 49-53) and components of "SCREENS" corresponding to

screen image descriptions (column 6, lines 37-40), said screen image descriptions

listing the components of "DRAWS" that compose a screen image to be displayed

(column 6, lines 45-49); and

constructing an animated image by superposition of an animated image

background corresponding to a principal broadcast and an image grouping together at

least a part of elemental components by an execution program loaded in the digital

terminal (column 4, lines 19-21; column 3, lines 54-56; figures 1 and 2), the image of

grouped elemental components being created by interpreting the components of

"INITIALIZATIONS" to determine the position in the data structure of the components of

"DRAWS" belonging to the screen image to be displayed and displaying the

components of "DRAWS" belonging to the screen image to be displayed (column 4,

lines 10-22; column 7, lines 2-8).

Chernock does not disclose a process comprising associating a series of stimuli

and actions to enable said navigation between screen images; and grouping said

elemental components in different classes according to treatment the elemental

components require by said digital terminal, the elemental components within each

class requiring common treatment by said digital terminal.

In an analogous art, LaRocca teaches a process comprising associating a series

of stimuli and actions to enable said navigation between screen images (column 7, line

64 – column 8, line 3); and grouping said elemental components in different classes

according to treatment the elemental components require by said digital terminal, the

elemental components within each class requiring common treatment by said digital

terminal (figure 9; column 16, lines 29-32).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in

the art to add the user customized menus taught by LaRocca to the process disclosed

by Chernock. The motivation would have been to provide a customized experience for

the users, therefore making the system more enticing to use.

Claim 13 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 1, wherein claim 13 adds the

limitation of an advertisement, which is found in LaRocca (figure 3A, part 322).

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected on the same grounds as claim 1.

Referring to claim 4, Chernock discloses a process according to Claim 1, wherein

the graphic representations are selected from the group consisting of text (column 6,

lines 47-49), geometric shapes, lines, points, color changes, fonts and line thickness.

Referring to claim 11, Chernock discloses a process according to Claim 2,

wherein at least one or more different stimuli selected from the group consisting of:

pressure on any key of a remote control or front panel, events linked to a clock (column

4, lines 15-16), events linked to the end of a connection of the modem, beginning of a

data capture and end of a data capture; and beginning of synchronization are assigned

to the "SCREENS."

Referring to claim 12, Chernock discloses a process according to Claim 11,

wherein the stimuli can trigger at least one action selected from the group consisting of:

visualization of any autonomous interactive application; visualization of any channel;

connection of the modem; changing of the screen image (column 6, lines 37-40 and 47-

49); and quitting the application.

Referring to claim 14, Chernock does not disclose a process according to Claim 1, wherein the "SCREENS" are interactive screens having stimuli and actions assigned thereto; the transmitting step comprises transmitting a plurality of the interactive screen; and the process further comprises the step of navigating among the plurality of interactive screens.

LaRocca discloses a process according to Claim 1, wherein the "SCREENS" are interactive screens having stimuli and actions assigned thereto; the transmitting step comprises transmitting a plurality of the interactive screen; and the process further comprises the step of navigating among the plurality of interactive screens (figure 9; column 16, lines 29-32).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the user customized menus taught by LaRocca to the process disclosed by Chernock. The motivation would have been to provide a customized experience for the users, therefore making the system more enticing to use.

Referring to claim 15, Chernock discloses a process according to Claim 1, wherein at least one of the stimuli is a top of synchronization (column 4, lines 17-18).

Referring to claim 18, Chernock does not disclose a process of Claim 1 further comprising the step of constructing a second animated image of another image screen of said application when a stimulus and corresponding action of the previous image

screen is detected by said digital terminal to enable the navigation from the previous image screen to the another image screen.

In an analogous art, LaRocca teaches a process of Claim 1 further comprising the step of constructing a second animated image of another image screen of said application when a stimulus and corresponding action of the previous image screen is detected by said digital terminal to enable the navigation from the previous image screen to the another image screen (figures 3A and 4).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the user customized menus taught by LaRocca to the process disclosed by Chernock. The motivation would have been to provide a customized experience for the users, therefore making the system more enticing to use.

2.   Claims 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chernock in view of LaRocca as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Kamada.

Referring to claim 3, Chernock and LaRocca do not disclose a process according to Claim 1, wherein the elemental components belong to predefined classes of graphic elements enabling definition of an image and said elemental components are stored in memory according to their membership class.

In an analogous art, Kamada teaches a process according to Claim 1, wherein the elemental components belong to predefined classes of graphic elements enabling

definition of an image and said elemental components are stored in memory according to their membership class (column 32, lines 23-30; figure 38).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the graphic element classes taught by Kamada in the process disclosed by Chernock and LaRocca. The motivation would have been to enable the system to use less information to encode an object by allowing it to inherit features from its parents (Kamada: column 32, lines 25-30).

Referring to claim 5, Chernock and LaRocca do not disclose a process according to Claim 3, wherein the elemental components are stored in memory sequentially in their class in order of their use in construction of the animated images.

In an analogous art, Kamada teaches a process according to Claim 3, wherein the elemental components are stored in memory sequentially in their class in order of their use in construction of the animated images (column 32, lines 23-25; figure 38).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the animation storage method taught by Kamada in the process disclosed by Chernock and LaRocca. The motivation would have been to allow for more complex animations to be able to be created.

Referring to claim 6, Chernock and LaRocca do not disclose a process according to Claim 3, wherein display of the elemental components is implemented according to membership classes and according to pre-selected criteria for each class.

In an analogous art, Kamada teaches a process according to Claim 3, wherein display of the elemental components is implemented according to membership classes and according to pre-selected criteria for each class (column 32, lines 23-30; figure 38).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the graphic element classes taught by Kamada in the process disclosed by Chernock and LaRocca. The motivation would have been to enable the system to use less information to encode an object by allowing it to inherit features from its parents (Kamada: column 32, lines 25-30).

Referring to claim 7, Chernock and LaRocca do not disclose a process according to Claim 3, wherein display of the elemental components is implemented according to membership classes and according to pre-selected criteria for each class.

In an analogous art, Kamada teaches a process according to Claim 3, wherein display of the elemental components is implemented according to membership classes and according to pre-selected criteria for each class (column 32, lines 23-30; figure 38).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the element class processing taught by Kamada in the process disclosed by Chernock and LaRocca. The motivation would have been to enable the system to use less time to decode an object by allowing it to inherit features from its parents (Kamada: column 32, lines 25-30).

Referring to claim 8, Chernock does not disclose a process according to Claim 3, wherein the elemental components are displayed by a specific interface in a digital decoder.

In an analogous art, LaRocca teaches a process according to Claim 3, wherein the elemental components are displayed by a specific interface in a digital decoder (figure 2, part 206; column 5, lines 33-45)

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use a digital decoder, as taught by LaRocca, to display the animation disclosed by Chernock and Kamada. The motivation would have been that it is well known in the art to use digital decoders in set top boxes.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin E. Shepard whose telephone number is (571) 272-5967. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JS

CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600